JAN 6 1967
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLER

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, A.D., 1966

No. 940

ALEXANDER WALLACE,

Petitioner,

VS.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Respondent.

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The Supreme Court Of Illinois.

ARTHUR J. O'DONNELL,
100 N. LaSalle Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60602,
Area Code 312-263-5747,
Counsel for Petitioner.

MIDWEST LAW PRINTING CO., 336 N. MICHIGAN, CHICAGO 60601, FINANCIAL 6-3988

INDEX

	PAGE
Reference to Reports of Opinions	1
Statement of Jurisdictional grounds	1
Questions presented for review	2
Constitutional provisions involved	2
Statement of the case	2
Raising of the federal questions	5
Proceedings in federal courts	5
Reasons for granting the writ	6
Conclusion	9

List Of Authorities.

Chambers v. Florida, 309 U.S. 227	6, 8
Culombe v. Connecticut, 367 U.S. 568	6, 7
Mallory v. U. S., 354 U.S. 449	7
Mc Nabb v. U. S., 318 U.S. 332	7
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436	7
U. S. v. Bayer, 331 U.S. 532	8
Watts v. Indiana, 338 U.S. 49	6

Appendix A.

Opinion of which review is sought	1a-5a

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, A.D., 1966

No.

ALEXANDER WALLACE,

Petitioner,

VS.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Respondent.

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The Supreme Court Of Illinois.

(a) REFERENCE TO REPORTS OF OPINIONS.

Wallace v. *Illinois,* 35 Ill. 2d 251; 220 N.E. 2d 198; Gen. No. 39288 is attached as Appendix A.

(b) STATEMENT OF JURISDICTIONAL GROUNDS.

Final process issued from the Supreme Court of Illinois on October 8, 1966. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Title 28, USC, Sec. 1257 (3).

(c) QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.

Does a conviction resulting from a plea of guilty which is based upon the use of an involuntary confession violate rights guaranteed under the Fourteenth Amendment?

(d) CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED.

Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments and Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth.

(e) STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

On June 17, 1962, the body of Herbert Kwate was found some distance from a highway near Carpentersville, Kane County, Illinois. He had been shot several times and was dead when found. There was no witness to the killing. At 11:00 P.M. on June 19th, petitioner, in the company of another, proceeded to a Chicago police station because of information that a detective wanted to talk to him. The detective was not on duty, but neither were permitted to leave and they were questioned by other officers. They were questioned several times during the night, separated and placed in various rooms in the station. At 8:45 A.M. on the 20th, they were taken to another station, questioned further, and later that morning transported to the Central Police Station and Court Building, photographed and fingerprinted and returned to the second station. They were not taken into court, although various courts were in session in the building. (Abst. 3)

In the early afternoon of the same day, petitioner was placed in a police vehicle, driven some distance away but when he became ill, was returned. The officers state that he was being returned to the first station to give a statement. Petitioner claimed that he had been beaten

in the stomach while in the auto, which claim was denied by the officer present. Shortly after his return to the station, petitioner was taken to the hospital, vomited and stated that he had become nauseated while in a cell at the station. (Abst. 4)

At 4:00 P.M. on June 20th, petitioner was delivered over to the sheriff's police from Kane County and driven to Geneva, Illinois a distance of fifty miles and two counties away where he was lodged in the County Jail at 6:00 P.M. on that date. Petitioner was not charged with any offense by police in Chicago, and the Kane County officers did not have any warrant or process for his arrest. Petitioner was questioned during the trip to Geneva and briefly again that evening. He was questioned intermittently again on the 21st, and again on the morning of the 22nd. Following the questioning on the 22nd, he was placed in an auto with deputies to be returned to Chicago for release because there was no evidence on which to hold him. While enroute, a radio call was received in the squad, and petitioner was returned to Geneva for possible parole violation. Kane County authorities had no parole violation warrant in their possession. (Abst. 29)

At 8 P.M. on Saturday, June 23rd, five detectives from Chicago arrived at the County Jail and requested to see petitioner. A half hour after their arrival, an oral confession was obtained by these officers, which was later reduced to writing and signed after midnight on June 24th. Petitioner contended that physical force had been exerted during the questioning which resulted in the confession. This claim was denied by all the officers present.

Following the signing of the written statement, during the early morning hours of Sunday June 24th, a magis-

trate was brought to the County Jail and petitioner was formally charged with the murder of Herbert Kwate.

Later Sunday morning, petitioner was taken in a squad car and a search was made for a weapon. It was not found at that time, but was recovered by officers later that day.

Petitioner testified that following his confession, various law officers of Kane County stated they would help him if he did not hire a lawyer. He contended that the Chief Deputy Sheriff stated that he would know the term of his sentence before he plead guilty. This statement was corroborated by petitioner's mother, but denied by the deputy.

Within a matter of a few days following the confession, and up to and including the day petitioner plead guilty, he was permitted visits two or three times a week in the evening and on Sunday. These visits were always in a private room in the jail and petitioner's family was permitted to bring in clothing and food in direct contravention of jail regulations. Normal visiting hours were from 2 to 4 P.M. on Saturday for other prisoners and consisted of ten or fifteen minutes in a visitors cage. When questioned at the hearing, the Sheriff admitted that the privileges granted petitioner were not in his memory afforded any other prisoner. When petitioner's Mother was prompted to inquire as to the disparity of treatment, she was advised by the Sheriff that this was a "special case." (Abst. 11)

The Court appointed counsel for petitioner on July 11th. On August 6th he plead guilty to the charge of murder, and on August 9th a hearing in aggravation and mitiga-

tion was had, and the confession obtained from the petitioner on June 23rd was read to the Court. On August 13th petitioner appeared before the Grand Jury and an indictment was returned against one Gary D'Alessandro charging the crime of murder. On August 15th, petitioner was sentenced to 33 to 55 years.

(f) THE RAISING OF THE FEDERAL QUESTIONS.

Petition for a New Trial under the Post Conviction Hearing Act, Chap. 38, Sec. 826-832, Ill. Rev. Stat. was filed January 17, 1964.

Answer of the People of the State of Illinois filed March 26, 1964.

Petition for New Trial denied September 3, 1964.

Notice of Appeal filed October 9, 1964.

Opinion of the Supreme Court of Illinois rejected petitioner's contention and affirmed the judgment of the Circuit Court of Kane County denying the Motion for a New Trial.

(g) PROCEEDINGS IN FEDERAL COURT.

(None).

(h) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.

The decision here is in conflict with this Court's holdings in *Culombe* v. *Connecticut,* 367 U.S. 568 and *Chambers* v. *Florida,* 309 U.S. 227.

A consideration of the issue presented by the facts of this case requires a determination of the following:

(1) Was the confession of the petitioner in fact voluntary under existing constitutional standards?

(2) Did the obtaining and use of the confession render the subsequent plea of guilty involuntary?

(1) *Was the confession of the petitioner in fact voluntary under existing constitutional standards?*

The constitutional test for admission of a confession has been whether it was made freely, voluntarily and without compulsion or inducement of any sort, or whether the defendant's will was overborne at the time he confessed. "Compulsion includes torture of mind as well as of body, for the will is as much affected by fear as by force." *Watts* v. *Indiana,* 338 U.S 49.

The admitted illegal detention of the petitioner for over four days, coupled with the intermittent questioning by one or more officers without counsel or a warning of his constitutional rights are factors which the Court must consider in any determination relative to the voluntariness of a confession. Equally significant were the transfer of petitioner from one police station to another in Chicago, and finally his transportation to a distant county without any warrant or process whatsoever. Finally, the consistent refusal to comply with the statutory mandate compelling the appearance of an accused before an

examining magistrate without unnecessary delay demonstrates the total disregard for constitutional guarantees. The statutory provision of Illinois requiring the appearance before a magistrate of persons arrested without a warrant is substantially the same as that required under the Federal Rules. We are not unmindful of this Court's reluctance to apply the principle of *Mc Nabb-Mallory* to state criminal trials and the consistency with which the Court has viewed the requirement as one of procedure and not rooted in constitutional grounds. The language of this Court in *Miranda* v. *Arizona,* 384 U.S. 436 may well point the way:

> "The supervisory rules, requiring production of an arrested person before a commissioner "without unnecessary delay" and excluding evidence obtained in default of that statutory obligation, were nonetheless responsive to the same considerations of Fifth Amendment policy that unavoidably face us now as to the States."

The combination of circumstances in the instant case were so inherently coercive as to overbear the will of petitioner and are inimical to any claim of voluntariness. In *Culombe,* the accused was detained in police custody for four nights and five days on a misdemeanor charge. He was questioned intermittently by one or more officers; he had neither counsel nor warning of his constitutional rights; and he was not brought before the magistrate until after his confession of murder at midnight on the fifth day.

This Court, in concluding that the confession violated due process, stressed the duration of the detention, distinguishing it from cases where confessions were elicited after merely hours of questioning on the day of arrest.

Also emphasized was the failure to bring the accused before a magistrate or advise him of his constitutional rights, and the emotional effect of the visits of his family. The similarity of circumstances present in the instant case brings it within the holding of *Culombe* and the decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois is in conflict with that holding.

(2) *Did the obtaining and use of the confession render the subsequent plea of guilty involuntary?*

A plea of guilty which flows directly from a confession obtained in violation of constitutional rights is the fruit of the violation and is no more voluntary than the confession that gave rise to it, and the defect can only be cured when those conditions have been removed.

In *Chambers* v. *Florida*, 309 U.S. 227, this Court reversed the conviction of four defendants, three of whom had entered pleas of guilty, on the grounds that the confessions obtained were involuntary and violated due process requirements. This Court stated:

> "Since petitioners have seasonably asserted the right under the Federal Constitution to have their guilt or innocence of a capital crime determined without reliance upon confessions obtained by means proscribed by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, we must determine independently whether petitioner's confessions were so obtained, by review of the facts upon which that issue necessarily turns."

The confession of the petitioner once made was forever present, it was always in the courtroom, was read to Court as part of the proceedings which resulted in his conviction and sentence. As suggested by the Court in *U. S.* v. *Bayer*, 331 U.S. 532:

> "Of course, after an accused has once let the cat out of the bag by confessing, no matter what the inducement, he is never thereafter free of the psychological and practical disadvantage of having confessed."

The taint of illegality which attaches itself to an involuntary confession discolors the whole proceedings, and to hold that a plea of guilty based upon such a confession may stand, as though it were unrelated to it, would be tantamount to denying the relationship between cause and effect and would make a mockery of concept of due process of law.

CONCLUSION.

If this Court agrees that the instant decision is in conflict with existing authority of this Court as relates confessions in state criminal proceedings, then certiorari should be granted to resolve the conflict or correct the judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTHUR J. O'DONNELL,
100 N. LaSalle Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60602,
Area Code 312-263-5747,
Counsel for Petitioner.